



Akademik Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (AJESS Journal)

From Classical Organizational Theories to Culture & People Management: A Critical Sociological Reading in Light of Algerian Cultural Specificity

Dr. Hafida Kebbatı, Modern Communicative Discourse Laboratory, University of Ain Temouchent (Algeria). hafida.kebbati@univ-temouchent.edu.dz ; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1337-2061>

Article History

Received: 13/03/2026; Accepted: 02/07/2026; Published: 02/09/2026

Abstract:

This article examines the structural transition in human resource management philosophy from the technobureaucratic model to Culture & People Management (CPM), which we frame as a deep epistemological and sociological rupture rather than a mere technical update. Drawing on over five years of participant observation in an Algerian university environment (2019–2024), we mobilise Bourdieu's theory of symbolic capital, Honneth's recognition theory, Sainsaulieu and Dubar's frameworks of professional identity, and Kunda's normative control thesis to critically analyse this transition. We also revisit Mercure et al.'s (1997) fieldwork in Algeria as a benchmark for understanding the structural tensions between formal management models and local cultural logics. Our analysis reveals an internal dialectic within CPM: a liberatory potential that restores the individual's symbolic agency, and a hegemonic potential that reproduces domination in humanist garb. We argue that in the Algerian context, CPM cannot fulfil its emancipatory promise unless it begins with explicit recognition of the organisational culture that already exists — not the one prescribed by imported management manuals. Our ethnological findings document a persistent yet evolving organisational duality, the prevalence of symbolic injustice in recognition structures, and the strategic nature of identity negotiation among Algerian academics.

Keywords: *sociology of organisations; Culture & People Management; symbolic capital; recognition theory; post-colonial management; Algerian context*

INTRODUCTION

The sociology of organisations faces a foundational question that transcends classical functional analysis: does the transition from Human Resource Management (HRM) to Culture & People Management (CPM) represent a genuine transformation in the bases of the individual–institution relationship, or is it a strategic re-framing of domination in humanist clothing? In raising this question, we do not approach CPM as a monolithic ideology to be rejected wholesale; rather, we treat it as a contested terrain whose emancipatory and hegemonic potentials coexist in tension. Answering it requires an epistemological critique that goes beyond the descriptive tracing of management theories to probe the deeper structures of power, meaning, and identity that constitute organisational life.

The Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century established the conditions for rational-instrumental organisations governed by the logic of efficiency, profit, and discipline (Weber 1922/1978). The major classical theories — Taylorism, Fayolism, and Weberian bureaucracy — emerged as analytical and applied structures that entrenched what Weber himself called the "Iron Cage" (Weber 1905/2001). When the Human Relations School attempted to escape this cage by discovering the "social man" in the Hawthorne experiments (Mayo 1933), it remained at its core devoted to productivity maximisation rather than genuine human liberation.

Today, in the context of the knowledge economy and cognitive-digital capitalism, CPM models claim to transcend these limits by placing organisational culture, shared values, and professional identity at the heart of management practice. Yet critical scholarship — from Bourdieu (1986) and Honneth (1995) to Kunda (2006) and Alvesson (2012) — casts doubt on the innocence of this discourse, demonstrating how "culture" can become a mechanism of normative control that mobilises workers' emotional and symbolic selves in service of capital.

In the Algerian context specifically, this question takes on particular acuity. Mercure et al. (1997) revealed a fundamental cultural gap between formal management patterns imported from colonial and state-socialist traditions and the local

cultural structures carrying distinct representations of authority, justice, and collective life. We argue that this gap explains much of the recurring failure of "administrative modernisation" projects that amount to little more than the formal transplantation of foreign models without genuine integration of local cultural capital.

Our central question is therefore: How does the CPM model reproduce the relationship between power, identity, and recognition within Algerian institutions, and does it constitute a liberatory transformation or a hegemonic modernisation in light of local cultural specificity? From this, we derive four sub-questions: What are the analytical limits of classical theories in explaining contemporary organisational behaviour? How do contemporary critical theories re-frame the individual-institution relationship? What internal dialectic does CPM carry between liberation and soft control? And how does Algerian cultural specificity mediate the interpretation and application of this model?

The significance of our study operates at three levels. First, we offer a genealogical critique of organisational theories that goes beyond descriptive treatment to uncover the logic of power latent in each model. Second, our framework is genuinely multidisciplinary, combining the sociology of work, sociology of knowledge, and cultural criticism. Third, we offer a rare contextual analysis of the Algerian case according to a post-colonial critique that challenges the hegemony of Anglo-Saxon management models. Throughout this article, we speak consistently from the position of researchers immersed in the field we study — a position we treat not as a source of bias, but as what Strauss (1987) calls "accumulated tacit competence."

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH GAP

In our review of existing scholarship, we identify three distinct genealogies and three persistent gaps that motivate our intervention.

Crozier and Friedberg's *L'acteur et le système* (1977) constitutes a foundational moment in the critique of classical theories, restoring to human actors their reason, will, and strategies, and establishing that power is a reciprocal relation rather than a unidirectional hierarchical grant. Yet, as we note in our reading of this tradition, it remains less mature in addressing the cultural and symbolic dimensions of power. Sainsaulieu (1988) advances the analysis by revealing the institution as a field for identity construction through daily confrontations with authority and recognition — shifting the analytical lens from the structural to the micro-sociological. Dubar (2000) completes this trajectory by demonstrating that identity is not a fixed datum but a perpetually renewed interrogation linked to shifting forms of recognition.

Anglo-Saxon literature pivoted in the 1980s toward the organisational culture paradigm. Schein's (1985/2017) three-layer model — visible artefacts, espoused values, and unconscious basic assumptions — remains a powerful analytical tool. Yet Alvesson (2012), whose work we find indispensable, warns of the danger of reduction: when culture is treated as a manageable administrative variable, the epistemological paradox is that culture shapes the very managers who claim to administer it. Alqatawenh's (2024) recent systematic review confirms culture's centrality in explaining performance and innovation, but warns of the dominance of normative-functionalist approaches that ignore power relations. Truss et al. (2020) similarly call for a "context gap" correction — longitudinal studies that account for non-Western environments, a lacuna our study addresses directly.

Ben Issa (2019) offers a valuable field study demonstrating that the effectiveness of Algerian institutions depends closely on shared culture and individual belonging, though the study remains within a functionalist framework. Al-Alawi (2021) analyses transformations of HRM in Arab institutions under globalisation, but without the critical perspective needed to capture the gap between discourse and practice. Amarouche (2022) and Benyahia (2020) raise important questions about identity and organisational learning in Francophone contexts, yet both lack the critical dimension that our study seeks to provide.

From our critical survey, we identify three interlocking gaps. The first is a context gap: most studies apply Anglo-Saxon frameworks to Algerian and Maghrebi contexts without interrogating transferability. The second is a critical gap: most Arab and Algerian studies treat culture as an instrument for performance rather than as a field of power and contestation. The third is a methodological gap: descriptive cross-sectional approaches dominate, while mixed longitudinal studies capable of tracking identity and recognition transformations over time are absent.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Our theoretical architecture begins with Bourdieu's (1986) multiform concept of capital — economic, social, cultural, and symbolic — and his concept of the organisational field as a site of unequal distribution of capital. The critical danger we locate in CPM discourse is precisely the risk of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992): when "organisational culture" is presented as a shared and universal value, it may conceal the culture of the dominant group imposed as natural — leaving others in a position of symbolic domination. In our analysis of the Algerian university, we observe this dynamic in promotion criteria that privilege publication in English-language ranked journals over contribution to local knowledge, in imported evaluation templates that devalue local cultural competencies, and in the phenomenon of "forced cultural homogenisation" in the name of professionalism.

We mobilise Honneth's (1995) tripartite recognition framework — emotional-psychological (love and care), legal-political (rights and respect), and moral-social (esteem for contribution and competence) — to diagnose what we observe as endemic "symbolic disrespect" in Algerian institutional life. When recognition is absent across these spheres, Honneth argues that forms of disrespect emerge that produce moral injustice, feeding resistance, withdrawal, and silent rebellion. In our reading of this framework applied to the Algerian context, much of what is commonly labelled "passive" or "disengaged" behaviour among public-sector employees is better understood as a rational and morally grounded response

to systematic non-recognition. One long-serving faculty member told us: "Twenty years of experience count for nothing against a newly accredited certificate; the system recognises only the paper form, not actual knowledge." This testimony is, in Honneth's terms, a precise articulation of injustice at the third level of recognition: non-acknowledgement of the social value of contribution.

Kunda's (2006) ethnographic work in a high-tech American corporation constitutes the third pillar of our framework. His central thesis — that organisational culture proclaimed as freedom and creativity conceals a system of normative control more effective than bureaucratic control, because it targets workers' selves, emotions, and identities rather than merely their behaviours — resonates powerfully with our field observations. We complement Kunda with du Gay's (2000) counter-argument in defence of bureaucracy: the bureaucratic model, for all its rigidity, provided ethical and legal guarantees and protection from the arbitrariness of charismatic leadership. Our analysis does not pit these perspectives against each other; rather, we use their tension to map the complex terrain CPM occupies between emancipation and new forms of domination.

METHODOLOGY

Our research adopts a multi-level analytical-critical methodology resting on three integrated pillars. The first is a critical literature review following Foucault's (1977) genealogical method, which allows us to trace not only the intellectual evolution of organisational theories but the logics of power inscribed within each. The second is a secondary analysis of Mercure et al.'s (1997) Algerian fieldwork, re-read through our contemporary theoretical framework in a hermeneutic circle that allows the past data to speak to present conditions. The third is an ethnological field analysis grounded in our own experience — over five years of immersion in the Algerian university environment at Ain Temouchent Belhadj Bouchaib University (2019–2024).

Our ethnological methodology draws on three complementary tools. Through participant observation, we have occupied the dual position that Lévi-Strauss (1958) calls the anthropologist's "double stance" — insider and outsider simultaneously — allowing us to capture what we term the "Invisible Ordinary": the unremarkable daily practices that formal questionnaires cannot reach. Through multiple in-depth semi-structured interviews with faculty, administrative staff, and students at various levels, we collected a rich corpus of testimony analysed through the lens of Honneth's tripartite model. And through textual and documentary analysis of official university documents — strategic plans, quality assurance manuals, performance evaluation frameworks — we examined the gap between institutional discourse and institutional practice.

Our epistemological position requires explicit reflection. As an associate professor immersed in the very institution we study, we occupy what Bourdieu calls the "reflexive agent" position: a researcher who interrogates the conditions of knowledge production in the moment of producing it. We treat this dual position not as a source of bias, but as what Miles and Huberman (1994) call "triangulation": the intersection of external field data with our lived internal experience produces understanding that neither alone could provide. The "accumulated tacit competence" (Strauss 1987) that comes from years of daily participation in this institutional field is, we argue, a methodological asset rather than a liability — provided it is accompanied by sustained critical reflexivity, which we maintain throughout.

CLASSICAL THEORIES: A GENEALOGICAL CRITIQUE

Before examining the CPM transition, we consider it essential to subject the classical theories it claims to supersede to a genealogical critique — not to discard them, but to recover what they still illuminate and to expose the logic of power inscribed in each.

Taylor's (1911) "Principles of Scientific Management" cannot be read apart from their political and economic context: the One Best Way principle implicitly constructs the worker as a biological machine governed by material incentives (*Homo economicus*), rendering human engineering as feasible as mechanical engineering. Habermas (1984) correctly identifies this as a paradigm case of instrumental rationality that converts everything — including human beings — into means for productive ends. In our observation of the Algerian university, we find the Taylorist heritage persisting in its clearest forms: the institutional preoccupation with teaching hours over their quality, the reduction of research productivity to article counts rather than depth and impact, and the systematic hollowing out of intellectual work of its free creative content.

Fayol's (1916) claim to universal principles of administration is, in our reading, an epistemological illusion: his fourteen principles generalise French industrial leadership practice of the early twentieth century, carrying with them its particular culture, class structure, and hierarchy. The rigid unity of command and strict hierarchical structure that Fayol prescribes contradicts, at a fundamental level, the relational and network communication patterns that characterise collective cultures such as Algeria. Weberian bureaucracy (Weber 1922/1978), by contrast, carries an important corrective that we do not wish to lose: the "Iron Cage" is also, as du Gay (2000) reminds us, a system of ethical guarantees and protection from the arbitrariness of charismatic leadership. Our critique of bureaucracy does not, therefore, amount to its simple rejection.

The Human Relations School (Mayo 1933; Roethlisberger, Dickson 1939) revealed an obvious but revolutionary truth: the human being is primarily social, not primarily economic. Yet Friedmann's (1961) critique stands: the school did not liberate the individual from instrumentality but added a collective dimension to it — substituting moral management for material surveillance in the service of the same productive goal. Crozier and Friedberg's (1977) strategic analysis marks a genuine turning point by restoring to actors their strategies and zones of freedom. But, as we find in our own reading,

its tendency to neutralise the structural dimension of power is corrected by Bourdieu's concept of habitus: actors negotiate with strategies that domination itself has produced, so their struggle is typically conducted within the equation rather than against it.

RESULTS: AN ETHNOLOGICAL READING OF THE ALGERIAN UNIVERSITY

Our field analysis yields results at five interconnected levels. We present them not as isolated findings but as facets of a coherent ethnological portrait.

Our observation reveals that the Algerian university professor lives in a condition we term "split identity" — precisely what Dubar (2000) describes as identity as a perpetually renewed interrogation under transforming recognition regimes. The professor simultaneously inhabits an academic identity grounded in knowledge and professional competence, an administrative identity requiring compliance with state bureaucratic logic, and a collective cultural identity demanding solidarity with informal relational networks. These multiple identities rarely conflict openly, but they produce what Crozier calls "zones of ambiguity" that the Algerian organisational actor manages with acquired and remarkable proficiency.

Most strikingly, our interviews and observations document what we call "discursive schism": faculty members fluently articulate the values of the officially required institutional culture — quality, excellence, innovation — while privately maintaining entirely different convictions. This is what Scott (1985) terms "hidden transcripts": the real discourse that circulates in closed rooms, corridors, and faculty lounges, differing radically from the "public transcript" displayed in formal contexts. Our reading of this phenomenon is not moralistic; it is structural. The discursive schism is the rational response of actors navigating an institution that demands performed loyalty to values it does not itself honour in its practices.

In our field observations, forms of symbolic disrespect in Honneth's sense manifest in three recurring and systematic patterns. First, implicit experience is systematically excluded from formal appreciation: the knowledge accumulation produced by years of academic fieldwork is marginalised in evaluation and promotion systems that reward formal credentials over lived expertise. Second, "forced identity homogenisation" imposes imported knowledge production standards — article counts in internationally ranked journals, international research networks — without regard for the local research environment and its material and structural constraints. Third, centralized decision-making structures persistently exclude professors from genuine participation in educational and research governance, despite the proclaimed discourse of engagement and participation.

Against these forms of institutional disrespect, we observe in the Algerian university space diverse forms of covert resistance that are no less meaningful than open rebellion: deliberate slowing in executing unconvincing administrative instructions; reinterpreting regulations to expand the margin of professional freedom; building informal academic solidarity networks that compensate for the absence of institutional recognition; and what we term "double competence" — mastering formal fulfilment of official requirements while preserving spaces of authentic professional action. We interpret these not as dysfunctions but as rational adaptations — forms of what de Certeau (1984) would call "tactics" within a field that offers limited space for genuine "strategies."

Our ethnological analysis reveals that the actual organisational culture of the Algerian university institution differs fundamentally from the culture declared in official documents and leadership communications. The formal culture emphasises quality, excellence, international competition, and transparent governance. The actual culture is governed by quite different values: collective solidarity and mutual protection among colleagues, preference for social harmony over competitive efficiency, relational arbitration in task distribution, and recourse to informal intermediaries in conflict resolution. This is not, in our reading, simply a gap between ideal and real — it is a structural feature of institutional life that must be understood and worked with rather than denied.

This contradiction between formal and actual cultures produces what we call the "social cave": a condition of inevitable normative control failure (Kunda 2006) in which organisational actors learn to display one culture while practising another. Kunda's concept of "self-splitting" — the schism between the presentation-self that performs institutional requirements and the authentic self retaining its original values — applies directly here. Yet our field experience adds an important nuance: many Algerian organisational actors have developed such mastery in managing this schism that it has ceased to be a source of psychological pressure and has become, instead, a strategic resource — enabling effective operation in both the formal and informal registers of institutional life simultaneously.

One of our most consistent ethnological observations is the pivotal role of informal solidarity networks in governing actual institutional life. In Coleman's (1990) terminology, these constitute "bonding social capital" — providing resources unavailable from formal structures: undisclosed information about administrative decision-making tendencies, protection from the negative consequences of opposing unconvincing directives, and a sense of belonging and collective recognition that compensates for the absence of institutional recognition. We document what we term "parallel management": the institution actually operates according to two simultaneous logics — the official formal logic declared in regulations and documents, and the informal logic shaped by networks of trust, solidarity, and shared interest. This is precisely what Mercure et al. (1997) observed in the 1990s, and our contemporary observation confirms it continues — though in forms more sophisticated and less explicitly contradictory than those Mercure documented.

Our field analysis reveals a quiet but profound inter-generational identity conflict. Senior professors whose professional identity was formed in the post-independence, state-socialist context carry a professional habitus that values stability,

seniority, and institutional loyalty. Younger professors formed in the context of academic globalisation and international rankings carry a different habitus that values individual distinction, international publication, and global research networks. This generational divergence is not merely a source of professional tension; it deepens the question — Bourdieusian at its core — of who possesses the right to define professional competence in the Algerian university. And the painful paradox we observe is that both generations suffer from the same fundamental problem: a recognition system incapable of simultaneously honouring experiential depth and international competence. Each generation feels unrecognised in its own distinct way, and both feelings are, in our analysis, equally legitimate.

DISCUSSION

The most significant insight our analysis yields is that CPM's liberatory and hegemonic potentials are not two opposites that alternate, but two faces of the same coin that coexist in daily practice. Empirical studies confirm that workers' emotional and identity engagement improves performance, innovation, and commitment (Denison 1990; Kotter, Heskett 1992). These findings are real and not to be dismissed. But they do not exempt CPM from critical scrutiny, particularly when culture is mobilised as an ideology to mask the continuation of inequality and to justify precarious employment — a risk our field observations confirm is far from theoretical.

We find Honneth's concept of "spheres of recognition" particularly useful in identifying the conditions under which CPM shifts from hegemonic to genuinely emancipatory: linking the culture discourse to a real redistribution of power, institutionalising mechanisms of dual recognition that acknowledge both individual competence and collective identity, and creating what we would call "institutionalised dissent" — formal channels through which disagreement with management decisions can be expressed without penalty. Our field experience also suggests a crucial additional condition: that CPM's liberatory potential requires a transformation in how managers themselves understand their role. Institutions that have achieved partial success in building effective organisational cultures in the Algerian context are, in our observation, not those that imported ready-made models, but those that provided their actors with sufficient interpretive latitude to translate formal requirements into meaningful practice within their specific cultural context. This resonates directly with Weick's (1995) insight that organisations do not operate according to their culture; they build their culture through their members' repeated sensemaking experiences.

Revisiting Mercure et al.'s (1997) findings through our contemporary lens, we observe that the structural duality they documented — the coexistence of a formal bureaucratic logic and an informal local logic governing actual action — has not disappeared but has evolved. It has shifted from a "defensive duality" (a reactive resistance to the imposed formal model) to what we term a "strategic duality": a conscious and increasingly sophisticated deployment of the dual space to achieve individual and collective goals simultaneously. This evolution is itself a lesson for institutional modernisation policymakers: the Algerian organisational actor is more flexible and adaptable than standard models assume, provided the institution grants genuine autonomy and recognition.

Our deepest analytical claim, synthesising Mercure with Bourdieu, is that "administrative modernisation" in Algeria has frequently functioned as a form of internal colonisation of subjectivities (Fanon 1961): transforming Algerian workers into carriers of a tense dual habitus — neither fully classical nor fully modern — while systematically failing to build the recognition structures that would make either modality genuinely liveable. In our reading, this is not a problem resolvable by importing a better model. It demands the harder work of building management institutions that learn from their local cultural capital and produce grounded organisational knowledge. The decisive lesson our discussion yields: CPM in Algeria will not realise its liberatory potential so long as it begins from imported cultural values rather than from the explicit and deliberate recognition of the culture that actually exists.

All the analytical threads of our study converge on an epistemological conclusion we wish to state plainly: researchers and practitioners in Algerian organisational sociology are invited to what we call a "quiet methodological revolution" — liberation from the compulsion to import Western theoretical frameworks as the sole reference, and engagement in building organisational knowledge genuinely grounded in the specificity of Algerian experience. This does not mean rejecting Bourdieu, Honneth, or Kunda — we find them indispensable — but using them as analytical lenses rather than prescriptive blueprints, and interrogating their applicability to an organisational context that differs in historically and culturally specific ways. The rich Algerian anthropological heritage — from Bourdieu's own early writings on Algeria (1958, 1963) to the contributions of Algerian social anthropologists — constitutes an exceptional epistemic resource still awaiting systematic investment in the field of organisational sociology.

CONCLUSIONS

Our study arrives at four principal conclusions. First, the transition from HRM to CPM is not a technical evolution in management tools but a shift in the system of generating meaning, identity, and power within institutions. This shift is not inherently liberatory: it carries the potential for reproducing domination through mechanisms more effective than Weberian bureaucracy reproduces, because they target internal selves rather than merely external behaviours. Second, the classical theories — Taylorism, Fayolism, bureaucracy, human relations, strategic analysis — are not historical ruins of expired validity; they remain an analytical resource that productive sociological critique reinvests after reviewing their anthropological assumptions and contextual limits.

Third, Algerian cultural specificity — as revealed by Mercure's study in terms of the strength of collective bonds, the ambivalent relationship with authority, and the centrality of verbal and symbolic communication — is not an obstacle to administrative modernisation but a cultural asset. It can be deployed in building grounded and humanistic management

models, if managed with genuine sociological awareness. Our field component adds that this specificity is not static: it evolves in continuous interaction with globalisation pressures and profound generational transformations, making any management model that ignores it build on shifting ground. Fourth, the organisational duality that Mercure observed in 1997 has evolved from a defensive to a strategic form — and this evolution is, in our analysis, a lesson for institutional modernisation: the Algerian organisational actor is more flexible and adaptive than normative models assume, provided genuine autonomy and recognition are extended.

In terms of practical implications, our study suggests three priorities. For institutional managers: conduct a genuine cultural diagnosis before any modernisation project, using mixed methodologies to map the institution's actual value and identity landscape; design "values management" processes grounded in participatory dialogue rather than top-down proclamation; and link CPM discourse to concrete structural reforms in organisational justice — transparent promotion, genuine decision participation, and institutionalised dissent. For researchers: our work calls urgently for longitudinal mixed-methods studies tracking identity and recognition transformations in Algerian institutions over time, for the development of culturally adapted measurement tools for organisational recognition, and for comparative Maghrebi research that can identify common and differentiated specificities.

The deepest challenge at the heart of our study remains: CPM will not become a genuinely liberatory horizon in the Algerian context until the Algerian worker — with their identity, memory, collective values, and contradictions — becomes a recognised actor in producing organisational meaning, rather than merely a recipient of a model packaged elsewhere.

References

- Al-Alawi, S. 2021. 'Human Resource Management and the Transition from Traditional to Cultural Approaches', *Journal of Management and Economic Studies* 15(1): 77–89.
- Alqatawenh, A. 2024. 'Organizational Culture: A Systematic Review', *Cogent Business & Management* 11(1): Article 2340129.
- Alvesson, M. 2012. *Understanding Organizational Culture*. Second ed. London: Sage.
- Amarouche, M. 2022. 'Organizational Culture and Identity at Work: Case Studies in the Francophone Environment', *Maghrebi Journal of Management* 9(4): 55–73.
- Ben Issa, Y. 2019. 'Organizational Culture and Institutional Effectiveness', *Algerian Journal of Sociology* 17(2): 114–132.
- Benyahia, S. 2020. 'Management Transformations in the Age of Learning Organizations', *International Sociological Notebooks* 152(1): 101–117.
- Bourdieu, P. 1958. *Sociologie de l'Algérie*. Paris: PUF.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. 'The Forms of Capital', in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. J. Richardson. New York: Greenwood Press, 241–258.
- Bourdieu, P.; Wacquant, L. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crozier, M.; Friedberg, E. 1977. *L'acteur et le système*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
- Denison, D. R. 1990. *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York: Wiley.
- du Gay, P. 2000. *In Praise of Bureaucracy: Weber, Organization, Ethics*. London : Sage.
- Dubar, C. 2000. *La socialisation : Construction des identités sociales et professionnelles*. 2nd ed. Paris : Armand Colin.
- Fanon, F. 1961. *Les damnés de la terre*. Paris : Maspero.
- Fayol, H. 1916. *Administration industrielle et générale*. Paris: Dunod.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Friedmann, G. 1961. *The Anatomy of Work*. London: Heinemann.
- Habermas, J. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 1. Boston : Beacon Press.
- Honneth, A. 1995. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kotter, J. P.; Heskett, J. L. 1992. *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Kunda, G. 2006. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1958. *Anthropologie structurale*. Paris: Plon.
- Mayo, E. 1933. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: Macmillan.
- Mercure, D.; Harricane, B.; Seghir, S.; Steenhaut, A. 1997. *Culture et gestion en Algérie*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Miles, M. B.; Huberman, A. M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Parker, M. 2002. *Against Management: Organization in the Age of Managerialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Roethlisberger, F. J.; Dickson, W. J. 1939. *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sainsaulieu, R. 1988. *L'identité au travail*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Schein, E. H. 2017. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 5th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, J. C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Strauss, A. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, F. W. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Truss, C.; Shantz, A.; Soane, E.; Alfes, K.; Delbridge, R. 2020. 'Mind the Context Gap', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 31(1): 6–46.
- Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society*, ed. G. Roth, C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)
- Weber, M. 2001. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. T. Parsons. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1905)
- Weick, K. E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. London: Sage.